

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 13-17, 20, 22, 24-27, 29, 32-37 are pending in the present application. Claims 2, 4, 9, 11-12, 18-19, 21, 23, 28, 30-31, and 38 are canceled; claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 13-17, 20, 22, 24-27, 29, 32-37, are amended; and no claims were added. The listing of the claims beginning on page 2 of this response replaces all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application.

Applicants are not conceding in this application the subject matter removed from amended claims and/or in canceled claims is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. The present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

I. Decision on Appeal

On February 11, 2011, the Board of Appeals and Interferences (hereafter “the Board”) issued a Decision in regard to Applicants’ Appeal in this application. The Board affirmed the Examiner in part, but concluded that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 4, 8, 14, 18, 23, 27, 33, and 37.

II. Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 4. Claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 18. Claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 23. Claim 29 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 37.

Claims 10 and 29 have been amended to recite only one method rather than a first method and a second method. Applicants submit that the change does not affect the scope of the claims. No new matter has been added to the claims.

Claims 10 and 29 have been amended to clarify the method and program product, respectively. Support for the amendments is found at least in paragraph [0029] and [0033] of the specification.

In addition, the claims have been amended in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 101 to reflect changes in the interpretation of 35 U.S.C 101 in regard to method claims and to program product claims. Support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraphs [0025] and [0026] of the specification and in Figures 1, 2 and 4 of the drawings.

III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: March 31, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Rudolf O. Siegesmund/

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Reg. No. 37,720
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants